UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/586,265	07/14/2006	Masahiro Kaneda	Q108023	7772
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 05/14/200 ON, PLLC	EXAMINER		
	LVÁNIA AVENUE, N	ANDERSON, CATHARINE L		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20037	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3761	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/586,265	KANEDA, MASAHIRO		
Examiner	Art Unit		
	Ait Oille		

	Lynne Anderson	3761					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>01 May 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as let forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the second s	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, k (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or (d) They present additional deims without appealing a second content of the proposition of the proposit	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); w); ter form for appeal by materially red	E below); ducing or simplifying th					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c		cted claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 13-22. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAMIT OF OTHER FORDER		be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Tatyana Zalukaeva/	/Lynne Anderson/						
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3761	Examiner, Art Unit 3761						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment includes combinations of limitations not previously considered together, and therefore will require further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments have been considered but are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's argument that Driskell fails to disclose boundary lines dividing each design that are very clear and a relationship between the widths and the cutting intervals of the design patterns that is clearly specified, it is noted that these features are not disclosed in the present claims. The present claims merely disclose that boundary lines and certain patterns can be accommodated by the diaper, which is not a positive recitation of a structural feature. The language of the claims does not clearly recite the limitations being argued, and therefore the arguments are not persuasive.